

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 6-19, 25, 27-30, 40-44, 46-53, 74-85, 87, 90-93 and 95-98 are pending in the application, with claims 6, 25, 40, 74, and 90 being the independent claims. Claims 40, 46-48, 50, 51, 74, and 90 are currently amended to define the claimed invention even more clearly. Claims 75-85, 87, 91-93, and 95-98 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowed Claims

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's allowance of claims 6-19, 25, 27-30, 40-44, and 46-53.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 74-85, 87, 90-93, and 95-98 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, on the basis that "[t]he claim(s) contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention." The Examiner alleged that claims 90-98 recited "'means for enabling' which are not found in the disclosed figures/specification." Applicants traverse the rejection. Applicants submit that the originally filed specification fully

meets the enablement requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1). However, claims 75-85, 87, 91-93, and 95-98 have been cancelled solely to expedite prosecution and now render rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 74 and 90 are well supported by the specification such that a person skilled in the art would have been able to make and/or use the claimed invention. Applicants have further amended these claims for clarity and to place them in even better condition for allowance or further examination. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have also removed the recitation of "means for enabling" within the claims to expedite prosecution. Based on the amendments above, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

The instant and originally filed specification clearly supports and enables a computer program product for providing gateway services as now recited in amended claim 74. For instance, at the very least, Figures 3A-3C, 6A, 11, 19, 20, 21A, 21B, 22A, and 149 refer to the gateway server and its features and components and are described in the specification section starting on page 26 through page 255. Further, figures 12-18 refer to a gateway server, routing server, and their embodiments and are described in the specification section starting on page 26 through page 255. Figures 42-66 refer to the configuration of the features and components of the gateway server, routing server, and database server and are described in the specification section starting on page 26 through page 255. Figures 94-118 refer to the configuration of the features and properties of the gateway server and are described in the specification section starting on page 26 through page 255.

The instant and originally filed specification clearly supports and enables a computer program product for providing routing services as now recited in amended claim 90. For instance, at the every least, Figures 3D, 6B, 7-10, 22B, and 147 refer to a routing server and its features and components and are described in the specification section starting on page 26 through page 255. Figures 42-66 refer to the configuration of the features and components of a gateway server, routing server, and database server and are described in the specification section starting on page 26 through page 255.

The remaining figures refer to supporting aspects of example gateway services and routing functions including a database server (FIGS 4, 22C, 148, and 150-158), provisioning system (FIGS. 145, 159, and 161), management system (FIGS. 146, 160A, 160B, and 162), network manager (FIGS 163 and 164), installation of a software system (FIGS. 23-41), configuration of driver resources (FIGS. 67-79), configuration of line groups (FIGS. 80-88), service modules (FIGS. 89-93), configuration of routes (FIGS. 119-125), and configuration of the database server (FIGS. 127-144) which are described in detail in the specification section pages 26 through page 255.

Applicants submit that the claims contain subject matter which is described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 74 and 90, and find them allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the

Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008


Scott *et al.*
Appl. No. 09/527,920

Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael V. Messinger
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,575

Date: April 9, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

MVM/RWM/j-k
805994_1.DOC